



SIRE DISCUSSION PAPER

SIRE-DP-2014-024

Atomic Cournotian Traders May Be Walrasian.

**Giulio Codognato
Sayantan Ghosal
Simone Tonin**

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

www.sire.ac.uk

Atomic Cournotian Traders May Be Walrasian

Giulio Codognato*, Sayantan Ghosal[†], Simone Tonin[‡]

September 2014

Abstract

In a bilateral oligopoly, with large traders, represented as atoms, and small traders, represented by an atomless part, when is there a non-empty intersection between the sets of Walras and Cournot-Nash allocations? Using a two commodity version of the Shapley window model, we show that a necessary and sufficient condition for a Cournot-Nash allocation to be a Walras allocation is that all atoms demand a null amount of one of the two commodities. We provide two examples which show that this characterization holds non-vacuously. When our condition fails to hold, we also confirm, through some examples, the result obtained by Okuno, Postlewaite, and Roberts (1980): small traders always have a negligible influence on prices, while the large traders keep their strategic power even when their behavior turns out to be Walrasian in the cooperative framework considered by Gabszewicz and Mertens (1971) and Shitovitz (1973).

Journal of Economic Literature Classification Numbers: C71, C72, D51.

1 Introduction

In his celebrated paper, Aumann (1964) proved that, in exchange economies with a continuum of traders, the core coincides with the set of Walras al-

*Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche e Statistiche, Università degli Studi di Udine, Via Tomadini 30, 33100 Udine, Italy, and EconomiX, Université de Paris Ouest Nanterre la Défense, 200 Avenue de la République, 92001 Nanterre Cedex, France. Financial support from MIUR (PRIN 20103S5RN3) is gratefully acknowledged.

[†]Adam Smith Business School, University of Glasgow, Main Building, Glasgow, G128QQ, United Kingdom.

[‡]Adam Smith Business School, University of Glasgow, Main Building, Glasgow, G128QQ, United Kingdom.

locations. Some years later, Gabszewicz and Mertens (1971) and Shitovitz (1973) introduced the notion of a mixed exchange economy, i.e., an exchange economy with large traders, represented as atoms, and small traders, represented by an atomless part, in order to analyze oligopoly in a general equilibrium framework. Gabszewicz and Mertens (1971) showed that, if atoms are not “too” big, the core still coincides with the set of Walras allocations whereas Shitovitz (1973), in his Theorem B, proved that this result also holds if the atoms are of the same type, i.e., have the same endowments and preferences.

Okuno, Postlewaite, and Roberts (1980) considered the result obtained by Shitovitz (1973) so counterintuitive to call into question the use of the core as the solution concept to study oligopoly in general equilibrium.¹ This lead them to replace the core with the Cournot-Nash equilibrium of a model of simultaneous, noncooperative exchange between large traders and small traders as the appropriate solution for the analysis of oligopoly in general equilibrium. The model of noncooperative exchange they used belongs to a line of research initiated by Lloyd S. Shapley and Martin Shubik (see Giraud (2003) for a survey of this literature). In particular, they considered a mixed exchange economy with two commodities which are both held by all traders. Moreover, they assumed that no trader is allowed to be both buyer and seller of any commodity. In this framework, they showed that, if there are two atoms of the same type who demand, at a Cournot-Nash equilibrium, a positive amount of the two commodities, then the corresponding Cournot-Nash allocation is not a Walras allocation. Therefore, under the assumptions of Shitovitz’s Theorem B, demanding a non-null amount of the two commodities by all the atoms is a sufficient condition for a Cournot-Nash allocation not to be a Walras allocation. This proposition allowed Okuno et al. (1980) to conclude that the noncooperative model they considered is a useful one to study oligopoly in a general equilibrium framework as the small traders always have a negligible influence on prices, while the large traders keep their strategic power even when their behavior turns out to be Walrasian in the cooperative framework considered by Shitovitz (1973).

In this paper, we raise the question whether, in mixed exchange economies, an equivalence, or at least a nonempty intersection, between the sets of Walras and Cournot-Nash allocations may hold. In order to further simplify our analysis, we consider the model of bilateral oligopoly introduced by

¹Okuno et al. (1980) did not quote the result obtained by Gabszewicz and Mertens (1973). Nevertheless, their argument also holds, *mutatis mutandis*, for this result.

Gabszewicz and Michel (1997) and further analyzed by Bloch and Ghosal (1997), Bloch and Ferrer (2001), Dickson and Hartley (2008), Amir and Bloch (2009), among others. By using this model, we still remain in a two-commodity setting but we assume that each trader holds only one of the two commodities whose aggregate amount is strictly positive in the economy. In particular, we shall use a bilateral oligopoly version of the Shapley window model.² This model was first proposed informally by Lloyd S. Shapley and further analyzed, in the case of finite economies, by Sahi and Yao (1989), in economies with an atomless continuum of traders, by Codognato and Ghosal (2000), and, in mixed exchange economies, by Busetto, Codognato, and Ghosal (2011). In particular, Codognato and Ghosal (2000) proved that the sets of Walras and Cournot-Nash allocations coincide in economies with an atomless continuum of traders, thereby providing a noncooperative version of Aumann's theorem. Here, we first show, through some examples, that this threefold equivalence may not hold, in the bilateral oligopoly configuration, even under the assumptions made by Gabszewicz and Mertens (1971) and Shitovitz (1973), thereby confirming the result obtained by Okuno et al. (1980). We then answer our main question by proving a theorem which states that demanding a null amount of one of the two commodities by all the atoms is a necessary and sufficient condition for a Cournot-Nash allocation to be a Walras allocation. This result does not depend on assumptions on the atoms' size, as in Gabszewicz and Mertens (1971), or on their types, as in Shitovitz (1973), but only on their demand behavior at a Cournot-Nash equilibrium. We also provide two examples which show that this characterization theorem is non-vacuous.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the mathematical model. In Section 3, we state the main equivalence theorems. In Section 4, we provide some examples and we state and prove our main theorem. In Section 5, we draw some conclusions from our analysis.

2 The mathematical model

We consider a pure exchange economy with large traders, represented as atoms, and small traders, represented by an atomless part. The space of traders is denoted by the measure space (T, \mathcal{T}, μ) , where T is the set of

²This two-commodity version of the Shapley window model differs from an analogous version of the models à la Shapley and Shubik for the rule of price formation even if, in the two types of models, the traders' final holdings are the same.

traders, \mathcal{T} is the σ -algebra of all μ -measurable subsets of T , and μ is a real valued, non-negative, countably additive measure defined on \mathcal{T} . We assume that (T, \mathcal{T}, μ) is finite, i.e., $\mu(T) < \infty$. This implies that the measure space (T, \mathcal{T}, μ) contains at most countably many atoms. Let T_0 denote the atomless part of T . A null set of traders is a set of measure 0. Null sets of traders are systematically ignored throughout the paper. Thus, a statement asserted for “each” trader in a certain set is to be understood to hold for all such traders except possibly for a null set of traders. A coalition is a nonnull element of \mathcal{T} . The word “integrable” is to be understood in the sense of Lebesgue.

In the exchange economy, there are 2 different commodities. A commodity bundle is a point in R_+^2 . An assignment (of commodity bundles to traders) is an integrable function $\mathbf{x}: T \rightarrow R_+^2$. There is a fixed initial assignment \mathbf{w} , satisfying the following assumption.

Assumption 1. *There is a coalition S such that $\mathbf{w}^1(t) > 0$, $\mathbf{w}^2(t) = 0$, for each $t \in S$, and $\mathbf{w}^1(t) = 0$, $\mathbf{w}^2(t) > 0$, for each $t \in S^c$.*

An allocation is an assignment \mathbf{x} for which $\int_T \mathbf{x}(t) d\mu = \int_T \mathbf{w}(t) d\mu$. The preferences of each trader $t \in T$ are described by a utility function $u_t: R_+^2 \rightarrow R$, satisfying the following assumptions.

Assumption 2. *$u_t: R_+^2 \rightarrow R$ is continuous, strongly monotone, and quasi-concave, for each $t \in T$.*

Let $\mathcal{B}(R_+^2)$ denote the Borel σ -algebra of R_+^2 . Moreover, let $\mathcal{T} \otimes \mathcal{B}$ denote the σ -algebra generated by the sets $E \times F$ such that $E \in \mathcal{T}$ and $F \in \mathcal{B}$.

Assumption 3. *$u: T \times R_+^2 \rightarrow R$, given by $u(t, x) = u_t(x)$, for each $t \in T$ and for each $x \in R_+^2$, is $\mathcal{T} \otimes \mathcal{B}$ -measurable.*

An allocation \mathbf{y} dominates an allocation \mathbf{x} via a coalition S if $u_t(\mathbf{y}(t)) \geq u_t(\mathbf{x}(t))$, for each $t \in S$, $u_t(\mathbf{y}(t)) > u_t(\mathbf{x}(t))$, for a nonnull subset of traders t in S , and $\int_S \mathbf{y}(t) d\mu = \int_S \mathbf{w}(t) d\mu$. The core is the set of all allocations which are not dominated via any coalition.

A price vector is a nonnull vector $p \in R_+^2$. A Walras equilibrium is a pair (p^*, \mathbf{x}^*) , consisting of a price vector p^* and an allocation \mathbf{x}^* , such that $p^* \mathbf{x}^*(t) = p^* \mathbf{w}(t)$ and $u_t(\mathbf{x}^*(t)) \geq u_t(y)$, for all $y \in \{x \in R_+^2 : p^* x = p^* \mathbf{w}(t)\}$, for each $t \in T$. A Walras allocation is an allocation \mathbf{x}^* for which there exists a price vector p^* such that the pair (p^*, \mathbf{x}^*) is a Walras equilibrium.

We introduce now the strategic market game considering the two-commodity version of the reformulation of the Shapley window model proposed by Busetto et al. (2011). A strategy correspondence is a correspondence $\mathbf{B} : T \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(R_+^4)$ such that, for each $t \in T$, $\mathbf{B}(t) = \{b \in R_+^4 : \sum_{j=1}^2 b_{ij} \leq \mathbf{w}^i(t), i = 1, 2\}$, where b_{ij} represents the amount of commodity i that trader t offers in exchange for commodity j . A strategy selection is an integrable function $\mathbf{b} : T \rightarrow R_+^4$, such that, for each $t \in T$, $\mathbf{b}(t) \in \mathbf{B}(t)$. Given a strategy selection \mathbf{b} , we define the aggregate matrix $\bar{\mathbf{B}} = (\int_T \mathbf{b}_{ij}(t) d\mu)$. Moreover, we denote by $\mathbf{b} \setminus b(t)$ a strategy selection obtained by replacing $\mathbf{b}(t)$ in \mathbf{b} with $b \in \mathbf{B}(t)$. With a slight abuse of notation, $\mathbf{b} \setminus b(t)$ will also represent the value of the strategy selection $\mathbf{b} \setminus b(t)$ at t .

Then, we introduce two further definitions (see Sahi and Yao (1989)).

Definition 1. A nonnegative square matrix A is said to be irreducible if, for every pair (i, j) , with $i \neq j$, there is a positive integer k such that $a_{ij}^{(k)} > 0$, where $a_{ij}^{(k)}$ denotes the ij -th entry of the k -th power A^k of A .

Definition 2. Given a strategy selection \mathbf{b} , a price vector p is said to be market clearing if

$$p \in R_{++}^2, \sum_{i=1}^2 p^i \bar{\mathbf{b}}_{ij} = p^j (\sum_{i=1}^2 \bar{\mathbf{b}}_{ji}), j = 1, 2. \quad (1)$$

By Lemma 1 in Sahi and Yao (1989), there is a unique, up to a scalar multiple, price vector p satisfying (1) if and only if $\bar{\mathbf{B}}$ is irreducible. Then, we denote by $p(\mathbf{b})$ a function which associates with each strategy selection \mathbf{b} the unique, up to a scalar multiple, price vector p satisfying (1), if $\bar{\mathbf{B}}$ is irreducible, and is equal to 0, otherwise.

Given a strategy selection \mathbf{b} and a price vector p , consider the assignment determined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}^j(t, \mathbf{b}(t), p) &= \mathbf{w}^j(t) - \sum_{i=1}^2 \mathbf{b}_{ji}(t) + \sum_{i=1}^2 \mathbf{b}_{ij}(t) \frac{p^i}{p^j}, \text{ if } p \in R_{++}^2, \\ \mathbf{x}^j(t, \mathbf{b}(t), p) &= \mathbf{w}^j(t), \text{ otherwise,} \end{aligned}$$

$j = 1, 2$, for each $t \in T$.

Given a strategy selection \mathbf{b} and the function $p(\mathbf{b})$, the traders' final holdings are determined according with this rule and consequently expressed by the assignment

$$\mathbf{x}(t) = \mathbf{x}(t, \mathbf{b}(t), p(\mathbf{b})),$$

for each $t \in T$.³ It is straightforward to show that this assignment is an allocation.

We are now able to define a notion of Cournot-Nash equilibrium for this reformulation of the Shapley window model (see Codognato and Ghosal (2000) and Busetto et al. (2011)).

Definition 3. *A strategy selection $\hat{\mathbf{b}}$ such that $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ is irreducible is a Cournot-Nash equilibrium if*

$$u_t(\mathbf{x}(t, \hat{\mathbf{b}}(t), p(\hat{\mathbf{b}}))) \geq u_t(\mathbf{x}(t, \hat{\mathbf{b}} \setminus b(t), p(\hat{\mathbf{b}} \setminus b(t)))),$$

for each $b \in \mathbf{B}(t)$ and for each $t \in T$.⁴

A Cournot-Nash allocation is an allocation $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ such that $\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \mathbf{x}(t, \hat{\mathbf{b}}(t), p(\hat{\mathbf{b}}))$, for each $t \in T$, where $\hat{\mathbf{b}}$ is a Cournot-Nash equilibrium.

3 The equivalence theorems

The following theorem reminds us that, when the space of traders is atomless, the core and the sets of Walras and Cournot-Nash allocations are all equivalent.

Theorem 1. *Under Assumptions 1, 2, and 3, if $T = T_0$, then the core coincides with the set of Walras and Cournot-Nash allocations.*

Proof. The equivalence between the core and the set of Walras allocations was proved by Aumann (1964) in his Main Theorem whereas the equivalence between the sets of Walras and Cournot-Nash allocations was proved by Codognato and Ghosal (2000) in their Theorem 2. ■

Gabszewicz and Mertens (1971) and Shitovitz (1973) showed that an equivalence between the core and the set of Walras allocations may hold even when the space of traders contains atoms. In order to state their two main theorems, we need to introduce some further notation and definitions. Two traders $\tau, \rho \in T$ are said to be of the same type if $\mathbf{w}(\tau) = \mathbf{w}(\rho)$ and $u_\tau(\cdot) = u_\rho(\cdot)$. Let $A = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k, \dots\}$ be a partition of the set of atoms $T \setminus T_0$ such that A_k contains all the atoms which are of the same type as an

³In order to save in notation, with some abuse, we denote by \mathbf{x} both the function $\mathbf{x}(t)$ and the function $\mathbf{x}(t, \mathbf{b}(t), p(\mathbf{b}))$.

⁴Let us notice that, as this definition of a Cournot-Nash equilibrium explicitly refers to irreducible matrices, it applies only to active Cournot-Nash equilibria (on this point, see Sahi and Yao (1989)).

atom $\tau_k \in A_k$, for each $k = 1, \dots, |A|$, where $|A|$ denotes the cardinality of the partition A . Moreover, let T_k be the set of the traders $t \in T$ which are of the same type as the atoms in A_k , for each $k = 1, \dots, |A|$. Given a set T_k , denote by τ_{hk} the h -th atom belonging to the set T_k , for each $h = 1, \dots, |A_k|$, where $|A_k|$ denotes the cardinality of the set A_k . We can now state the two theorems.

Theorem 2. *Under Assumptions 1, 2, and 3, if, either $|A| = 1$ and $\sum_{h=1}^{|A_1|} \frac{\mu(\tau_{h1})}{\mu(T_1)} < 1$, or, $|A| > 1$ and $\sum_{k=1}^{|A|} \sum_{h=1}^{|A_k|} \frac{\mu(\tau_{hk})}{\mu(T_k)} \leq 1$, then the core coincides with the set of Walras allocations.*

Proof. See the proof of the theorem in Gabszewicz and Mertens (1971). ■

Theorem 3. *Under Assumptions 1, 2, and 3, if $|A| = 1$ and $|A_1| \geq 2$, then the core coincides with the set of Walras allocations.*

Proof. See the proof of Theorem B in Shitovitz (1973). ■

Okuno et al. (1980) already showed that the equivalence stated by Theorem 3 (Shitovitz's Theorem B) does not extend to the set of Cournot-Nash allocations, thereby breaking the symmetry of Theorem 1. In the next section, we further investigate the relation between the core and the sets of Walras and Cournot-Nash allocations.

4 Some examples, a proposition, and a theorem

In the following example (Example 1 in Shitovitz (1973)), the market of commodity 2 is monopolistic. The example shows that Theorems 2 and 3 cannot be extended to this case as $|A| = 1$, $|A_1| = 1$, and $\frac{\mu(\tau_{11})}{\mu(T_1)} = 1$. Moreover, in this market configuration, the set of Walras and Cournot-Nash allocations are disjoint as there is no Cournot-Nash equilibrium.

Example 1. *Consider the following specification of the exchange economy satisfying Assumptions 1, 2, and 3. $T_0 = [0, 1]$, $A_1 = \{2\}$, T_0 is taken with Lebesgue measure, $\mu(2) = 1$, $\mathbf{w}(t) = (4, 0)$, $u_t(x) = \sqrt{x^1} + \sqrt{x^2}$, for each $t \in T_0$, $\mathbf{w}(2) = (0, 4)$, $u_2(x) = \sqrt{x^1} + \sqrt{x^2}$. Then, there is an allocation in the core, which is not a Walras allocation, and there is no Cournot-Nash allocation.*

Proof. The unique Walras equilibrium is the pair (p^*, \mathbf{x}^*) , where $(p^{*1}, p^{*2}) = (1, 1)$, $(\mathbf{x}^{*1}(t), \mathbf{x}^{*2}(t)) = (2, 2)$, for each $t \in T_0$, $(\mathbf{x}^{*1}(2), \mathbf{x}^{*2}(2)) = (2, 2)$. As shown by Shitovitz (1973), the allocation $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ such that $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^1(t), \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^2(t)) = (1, 1)$,

for each $t \in T_0$, $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}^1(2), \tilde{\mathbf{x}}^2(2)) = (3, 3)$ is in the core but it is not a Walras allocation. Finally, it is straightforward to show that there is no Cournot-Nash allocation. ■

In the following example, all traders have the same utility function as in Example 1 but a competitive fringe competes with the monopolist in the market for commodity 2. The core coincides with the set of Walras allocations as the assumptions of Theorem 2 are satisfied but no Cournot-Nash allocation is in the core.

Example 2. Consider the following specification of the exchange economy satisfying Assumptions 1, 2, and 3. $T_0 = [0, 1]$, $A_1 = \{2\}$, T_0 is taken with Lebesgue measure, $\mu(2) = 1$, $\mathbf{w}(t) = (4, 0)$, $u_t(x) = \sqrt{x^1} + \sqrt{x^2}$, for each $t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, $\mathbf{w}(t) = (0, 4)$, $u_t(x) = \sqrt{x^1} + \sqrt{x^2}$, for each $t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, $\mathbf{w}(2) = (0, 4)$, $u_2(x) = \sqrt{x^1} + \sqrt{x^2}$. Then, there is a unique allocation in the core which is also the unique Walras allocation but which is not a Cournot-Nash allocation.

Proof. The unique Walras equilibrium is the pair (p^*, \mathbf{x}^*) , where $(p^{*1}, p^{*2}) = (\sqrt{3}, 1)$, $(\mathbf{x}^{*1}(t), \mathbf{x}^{*2}(t)) = (\frac{4}{\sqrt{3}+1}, \frac{12}{\sqrt{3}+1})$, for each $t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, $(\mathbf{x}^{*1}(t), \mathbf{x}^{*2}(t)) = (\frac{4}{\sqrt{3}+3}, \frac{4\sqrt{3}}{\sqrt{3}+1})$, for each $t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, $(\mathbf{x}^{*1}(2), \mathbf{x}^{*2}(2)) = (\frac{4}{\sqrt{3}+3}, \frac{4\sqrt{3}}{\sqrt{3}+1})$. Then, by Theorem 2, the unique Walras allocation is also the unique allocation in the core as $|A| = 1$, $|A_1| = 1$, and $\frac{\mu(\tau_{11})}{\mu(T_1)} < 1$. Suppose that \mathbf{x}^* is a Cournot-Nash allocation. Then, there is a strategy selection \mathbf{b}^* which is a Cournot-Nash equilibrium and which is such that $\mathbf{x}^*(t) = \mathbf{x}(t, \mathbf{b}^*(t), p(\mathbf{b}^*))$, for each $t \in T$. But then, \mathbf{b}^* must be such that $\mathbf{b}_{12}^*(t) = \frac{4\sqrt{3}}{\sqrt{3}+1}$, for each $t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, $\mathbf{b}_{21}^*(t) = \frac{4}{\sqrt{3}+1}$, for each $t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, $\mathbf{b}_{21}^*(2) = \frac{4}{\sqrt{3}+1}$. However, it is straightforward to verify that $\mathbf{b}^*(2) \notin \arg \max\{u_2(\mathbf{x}(t, \mathbf{b}^* \setminus b(2), p(\mathbf{b}^* \setminus b(2)))) : b \in \mathbf{B}(2)\}$, a contradiction. Then, the unique Walras allocation is not a Cournot-Nash allocation. ■

In the following example, all traders have the same utility function as in Example 1 but there are two oligopolists of the same type in the market for commodity 2. The core coincides with the set of Walras allocations as the assumptions of Theorem 3 are satisfied but no Cournot-Nash allocation is in the core.

Example 3. Consider the following specification of the exchange economy satisfying Assumptions 1, 2, and 3. $T_0 = [0, 1]$, $A_1 = \{2, 3\}$, T_0 is taken with Lebesgue measure, $\mu(2) = \mu(3) = 1$, $\mathbf{w}(t) = (4, 0)$, $u_t(x) = \sqrt{x^1} + \sqrt{x^2}$, for

each $t \in T_0$, $\mathbf{w}(2) = \mathbf{w}(3) = (0, 4)$, $u_2(x) = u_3(x) = \sqrt{x^1} + \sqrt{x^2}$. Then, there is a unique allocation in the core which is also the unique Walras allocation but which is not a Cournot-Nash allocation.

Proof. The unique Walras equilibrium is the pair (p^*, \mathbf{x}^*) , where $(p^{*1}, p^{*2}) = (\sqrt{2}, 1)$, $(\mathbf{x}^{*1}(t), \mathbf{x}^{*2}(t)) = (\frac{4}{\sqrt{2}+1}, \frac{8}{\sqrt{2}+1})$, for each $t \in T_0$, $(\mathbf{x}^{*1}(2), \mathbf{x}^{*2}(2)) = (\mathbf{x}^{*1}(3), \mathbf{x}^{*2}(3)) = (\frac{4}{\sqrt{2}+2}, \frac{4\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{2}+1})$. Then, by Theorem 3, the unique Walras allocation is also the unique allocation in the core as $|A| = 1$ and $|A_1| = 2$. Suppose that \mathbf{x}^* is a Cournot-Nash allocation. Then, there is a strategy selection \mathbf{b}^* which is a Cournot-Nash equilibrium and which is such that $\mathbf{x}^*(t) = \mathbf{x}(t, \mathbf{b}^*(t), p(\mathbf{b}^*))$, for each $t \in T$. But then, \mathbf{b}^* must be such that $\mathbf{b}_{12}^*(t) = \frac{4\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{2}+1}$, for each $t \in T_0$, $\mathbf{b}_{21}^*(2) = \mathbf{b}_{21}^*(3) = \frac{4}{\sqrt{2}+1}$. However, it is straightforward to verify that $\mathbf{b}^*(2) \notin \arg \max\{u_2(\mathbf{x}(t, \mathbf{b}^* \setminus b(2), p(\mathbf{b}^* \setminus b(2)))) : b \in \mathbf{B}(2)\}$, a contradiction. Then, the unique Walras allocation is not a Cournot-Nash allocation. ■

In Examples 2 and 3, there are atoms who demand a strictly positive amount of both commodities at a Walras equilibrium and the sets of Walras and Cournot-Nash allocations are disjoint. The following proposition generalizes those examples providing a necessary condition for a Walras allocation to be a Cournot-Nash allocation. In order to state the proposition, we need a further assumption on traders' utility functions.

Assumption 4. $u_t : R_+^2 \rightarrow R$ is continuously differentiable, for each $t \in T \setminus T_0$.

Proposition. Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3, and 4, if the pair (p^*, \mathbf{x}^*) is a Walras equilibrium such that $\mathbf{x}^*(\tau) \gg 0$, for an atom $\tau \in T \setminus T_0$, then \mathbf{x}^* is not a Cournot-Nash allocation.

Proof. Suppose that the pair (p^*, \mathbf{x}^*) is a Walras equilibrium such that $\mathbf{x}^*(\tau) \gg 0$, for an atom $\tau \in T \setminus T_0$. Moreover, suppose that \mathbf{x}^* is a Cournot-Nash allocation. Then, there is a strategy selection \mathbf{b}^* such that $\mathbf{x}^*(t) = \mathbf{x}(t, \mathbf{b}^*(t), p(\mathbf{b}^*))$, for each $t \in T$, where \mathbf{b}^* is a Cournot-Nash equilibrium. Since, given a trader $t \in T$, $p(\mathbf{b}^*)\mathbf{x}^*(t) = p(\mathbf{b}^*)\mathbf{w}(t)$ and p^* is the unique price vector such that $p^*\mathbf{x}^*(t) = p^*\mathbf{w}(t)$, $p^* = p(\mathbf{b}^*)$. Consider the atom $\tau \in T \setminus T_0$ and assume, without loss of generality, that $\mathbf{w}^1(\tau) = 0$ and $\mathbf{w}^2(\tau) > 0$. At a Cournot-Nash equilibrium, for the atom τ , the marginal rate of substitution must be equal to the marginal rate at which he can trade off commodity 1 for commodity 2 (see Okuno et al. (1980)). Moreover, at a

Walras equilibrium, the marginal rate of substitution must be equal to the relative price of commodity 1 in terms of commodity 2. These two conditions are expressed by the following equations:

$$\frac{dx^2}{dx^1} = -\frac{p^{*1}}{p^{*2}} \frac{\bar{\mathbf{b}}_{21}^*}{\bar{\mathbf{b}}_{21}^* - \mathbf{b}_{21}^*(\tau)\mu(\tau)} = -\frac{p^{*1}}{p^{*2}}.$$

Then, we must have $\mathbf{b}_{21}^*(\tau) = 0$. But then, $(\mathbf{x}^{*1}(\tau), \mathbf{x}^{*2}(\tau)) = (0, \mathbf{w}^2(\tau))$, a contradiction. Hence, \mathbf{x}^* is not a Cournot-Nash allocation. ■

The following example differs from Example 2 only in that the monopolist and the competitive fringe have quasi-linear utility functions. It shows that, under the assumptions of Theorem 2, the converse of the Proposition does not hold. At the unique Walras equilibrium, both the monopolist and the competitive fringe demand a null amount of commodity 2 and this unique Walras allocation is also the unique allocation in the core but it is not a Cournot-Nash allocation.

Example 4. Consider the following specification of the exchange economy satisfying Assumptions 1, 2, and 3. $T_0 = [0, 1]$, $A_1 = \{2\}$, T_0 is taken with Lebesgue measure, $\mu(2) = 1$, $\mathbf{w}(t) = (4, 0)$, $u_t(x) = \sqrt{x^1} + \sqrt{x^2}$, for each $t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, $\mathbf{w}(t) = (0, 4)$, $u_t(x) = \sqrt{x^1} + \frac{1}{10}x^2$, for each $t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, $\mathbf{w}(2) = (0, 4)$, $u_2(x) = \sqrt{x^1} + \frac{1}{10}x^2$. Then, there is a unique allocation in the core which is also the unique Walras allocation but which is not a Cournot-Nash allocation.

Proof. The unique Walras equilibrium is the pair (p^*, \mathbf{x}^*) , where $(p^{*1}, p^{*2}) = (\frac{\sqrt{21}+3}{2}, 1)$, $(\mathbf{x}^{*1}(t), \mathbf{x}^{*2}(t)) = (\frac{8}{\sqrt{21}+5}, 12)$, for each $t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, $(\mathbf{x}^{*1}(t), \mathbf{x}^{*2}(t)) = (\frac{8}{\sqrt{21}+3}, 0)$, for each $t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, $(\mathbf{x}^{*1}(2), \mathbf{x}^{*2}(2)) = (\frac{8}{\sqrt{21}+3}, 0)$. Then, by Theorem 2, the unique Walras allocation is also the unique allocation in the core as $|A| = 1$, $|A_1| = 1$, and $\frac{\mu(\tau_1)}{\mu(T_1)} < 1$. Suppose that \mathbf{x}^* is a Cournot-Nash allocation. Then, there is a strategy selection \mathbf{b}^* which is a Cournot-Nash equilibrium and which is such that $\mathbf{x}^*(t) = \mathbf{x}(t, \mathbf{b}^*(t), p(\mathbf{b}^*))$, for each $t \in T$. But then, \mathbf{b}^* must be such that $\mathbf{b}_{12}^*(t) = \frac{4\sqrt{21}+12}{\sqrt{21}+5}$, for each $t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, $\mathbf{b}_{21}^*(t) = 4$, for each $t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, $\mathbf{b}_{12}^*(2) = 4$. However, it is straightforward to verify that $\mathbf{b}^*(2) \notin \arg \max\{u_2(\mathbf{x}(t, \mathbf{b}^* \setminus b(2), p(\mathbf{b}^* \setminus b(2)))) : b \in \mathbf{B}(2)\}$, a contradiction. Then, the unique Walras allocation is not a Cournot-Nash allocation. ■

The following example differs from Example 3 only in that the two oligopolists have quasi-linear utility functions. It shows that, under the as-

sumptions of Theorem 3, the converse of the Proposition does not hold. At the unique Walras equilibrium, the two oligopolists demand a null amount of commodity 2 and this unique Walras allocation is also the unique allocation in the core but it is not a Cournot-Nash allocation.

Example 5. Consider the following specification of the exchange economy satisfying Assumptions 1, 2, and 3. $T_0 = [0, 1]$, $A_1 = \{2, 3\}$, T_0 is taken with Lebesgue measure, $\mu(2) = \mu(3) = 1$, $\mathbf{w}(t) = (4, 0)$, $u_t(x) = \sqrt{x^1} + \sqrt{x^2}$, for each $t \in T_0$, $\mathbf{w}(2) = \mathbf{w}(3) = (0, 4)$, $u_2(x) = u_3(x) = \sqrt{x^1} + \frac{1}{10}x^2$. Then, there is a unique allocation in the core which is also the unique Walras allocation but which is not a Cournot-Nash allocation.

Proof. The unique Walras equilibrium is the pair (p^*, \mathbf{x}^*) , where $(p^{*1}, p^{*2}) = (\sqrt{3} + 1, 1)$, $(\mathbf{x}^{*1}(t), \mathbf{x}^{*2}(t)) = (\frac{4}{\sqrt{3}+2}, 8)$, for each $t \in T_0$, $(\mathbf{x}^{*1}(2), \mathbf{x}^{*2}(2)) = (\mathbf{x}^{*1}(3), \mathbf{x}^{*2}(3)) = (\frac{4}{\sqrt{3}+1}, 0)$. Then, by Theorem 3, the unique Walras allocation is also the unique allocation in the core as $|A| = 1$ and $|A_1| = 2$. Suppose that \mathbf{x}^* is a Cournot-Nash allocation. Then, there is a strategy selection \mathbf{b}^* which is a Cournot-Nash equilibrium and which is such that $\mathbf{x}^*(t) = \mathbf{x}(t, \mathbf{b}^*(t), p(\mathbf{b}^*))$, for each $t \in T$. But then, \mathbf{b}^* must be such that $\mathbf{b}_{12}^*(t) = \frac{4\sqrt{3}+4}{\sqrt{3}+2}$, for each $t \in T_0$, $\mathbf{b}_{21}^*(2) = \mathbf{b}_{21}^*(3) = 4$. However, it is straightforward to verify that $\mathbf{b}^*(2) \notin \arg \max\{u_2(\mathbf{x}(t, \mathbf{b}^* \setminus b(2), p(\mathbf{b}^* \setminus b(2)))) : b \in \mathbf{B}(2)\}$, a contradiction. Then, the unique Walras allocation is not a Cournot-Nash allocation. ■

We now address the question whether, in mixed exchange economies, an equivalence, or at least a nonempty intersection, between the sets of Walras and Cournot-Nash allocations may hold. The following example differs from Example 4 only for the lower “weight” of commodity 2 for traders who have quasi-linear utility functions. At the unique Walras equilibrium, both the monopolist and the competitive fringe demand a null amount of commodity 2 and this unique Walras allocation is also the unique allocation in the core and the unique Cournot-Nash allocation.

Example 6. Consider the following specification of the exchange economy satisfying Assumptions 1, 2, and 3. $T_0 = [0, 1]$, $A_1 = \{2\}$, T_0 is taken with Lebesgue measure, $\mu(2) = 1$, $\mathbf{w}(t) = (4, 0)$, $u_t(x) = \sqrt{x^1} + \sqrt{x^2}$, for each $t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, $\mathbf{w}(t) = (0, 4)$, $u_t(x) = \sqrt{x^1} + \frac{1}{30}x^2$, for each $t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, $\mathbf{w}(2) = (0, 4)$, $u_2(x) = \sqrt{x^1} + \frac{1}{30}x^2$. Then, there is a unique allocation in the core which is also the unique Walras allocation and the unique Cournot-Nash allocation.

Proof. The unique Walras equilibrium is the pair (p^*, \mathbf{x}^*) , where $(p^{*1}, p^{*2}) =$

$(\frac{\sqrt{21}+3}{2}, 1)$, $(\mathbf{x}^*(t), \mathbf{x}^{*2}(t)) = (\frac{8}{\sqrt{21}+5}, 12)$, for each $t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, $(\mathbf{x}^*(t), \mathbf{x}^{*2}(t)) = (\frac{8}{\sqrt{21}+3}, 0)$, for each $t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, $(\mathbf{x}^*(2), \mathbf{x}^{*2}(2)) = (\frac{8}{\sqrt{21}+3}, 0)$. Then, by Theorem 2, the unique Walras allocation is also the unique allocation in the core as $|A| = 1$, $|A_1| = 1$, and $\frac{\mu(\tau_{11})}{\mu(T_1)} < 1$. Moreover, the strategy selection \mathbf{b}^* , where $\mathbf{b}_{12}^*(t) = \frac{4\sqrt{21}+12}{\sqrt{21}+5}$, for each $t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, $\mathbf{b}_{21}^*(t) = 4$, for each $t \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, $\mathbf{b}_{21}^*(2) = 4$, is the unique Cournot-Nash equilibrium and $\mathbf{x}^*(t) = \mathbf{x}(t, \mathbf{b}^*(t), p(\mathbf{b}^*))$, for each $t \in T$. Then, the unique Walras allocation is also the unique Cournot-Nash allocation. ■

The following example differs from Example 5 only for the lower “weight” of commodity 2 for traders who have quasi-linear utility functions. At the unique Walras equilibrium, the two oligopolists demand a null amount of commodity 2 and this unique Walras allocation is also the unique allocation in the core and the unique Cournot-Nash allocation.

Example 7. Consider the following specification of the exchange economy satisfying Assumptions 1, 2, and 3. $T_0 = [0, 1]$, $A_1 = \{2, 3\}$, T_0 is taken with Lebesgue measure, $\mu(2) = \mu(3) = 1$, $\mathbf{w}(t) = (4, 0)$, $u_t(x) = \sqrt{x^1} + \sqrt{x^2}$, for each $t \in T_0$, $\mathbf{w}(2) = \mathbf{w}(3) = (0, 4)$, $u_2(x) = u_3(x) = \sqrt{x^1} + \frac{1}{30}x^2$. Then, there is a unique allocation in the core which is also the unique Walras allocation and the unique Cournot-Nash allocation.

Proof. The unique Walras equilibrium is the pair (p^*, \mathbf{x}^*) , where $(p^{*1}, p^{*2}) = (\sqrt{3} + 1, 1)$, $(\mathbf{x}^*(t), \mathbf{x}^{*2}(t)) = (\frac{4}{\sqrt{3}+2}, 8)$, for each $t \in T_0$, $(\mathbf{x}^*(2), \mathbf{x}^{*2}(2)) = (\mathbf{x}^*(3), \mathbf{x}^{*2}(3)) = (\frac{4}{\sqrt{3}+1}, 0)$. Then, by Theorem 3, the unique Walras allocation is also the unique allocation in the core as $|A| = 1$ and $|A_1| = 2$. Moreover, the strategy selection \mathbf{b}^* , where $\mathbf{b}_{12}^*(t) = \frac{4\sqrt{3}+4}{\sqrt{3}+2}$, for each $t \in T_0$, $\mathbf{b}_{21}^*(2) = \mathbf{b}_{21}^*(3) = 4$, is the unique Cournot-Nash equilibrium and $\mathbf{x}^*(t) = \mathbf{x}(t, \mathbf{b}^*(t), p(\mathbf{b}^*))$, for each $t \in T$. Then, the unique Walras allocation is also the unique Cournot-Nash allocation. ■

Examples 6 and 7 differ from Examples 4 and 5 as, in the latter, all atoms who hold commodity 2 demand a null amount of this commodity at a Walras equilibrium but not at a Cournot-Nash equilibrium whereas, in the former, they also demand a null amount of commodity 2 at a Cournot-Nash equilibrium. The following theorem generalizes Examples 6 and 7 as it shows that demanding a null amount of one of the two commodities by all the atoms is a necessary and sufficient condition for a Cournot-Nash allocation to be a Walras allocation.

Theorem 4. Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3, and 4, let $\hat{\mathbf{b}}$ be a Cournot-Nash equilibrium and let $\hat{p} = p(\hat{\mathbf{b}})$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \mathbf{x}(t, \hat{\mathbf{b}}(t), p(\hat{\mathbf{b}}))$, for each $t \in T$. Then, the pair $(\hat{p}, \hat{\mathbf{x}})$ is a Walras equilibrium if and only if $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^1(t) = 0$ or $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^2(t) = 0$, for each $t \in T \setminus T_0$.

Proof. Let $\hat{\mathbf{b}}$ be a Cournot-Nash equilibrium and let $\hat{p} = p(\hat{\mathbf{b}})$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \mathbf{x}(t, \hat{\mathbf{b}}(t), p(\hat{\mathbf{b}}))$, for each $t \in T$. Suppose that the pair $(\hat{p}, \hat{\mathbf{x}})$ is a Walras equilibrium. Moreover, suppose that $\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\tau) \gg 0$, for an atom $\tau \in T \setminus T_0$. Then, $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is not a Cournot-Nash allocation, by the Proposition, a contradiction. Hence, $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^1(t) = 0$ or $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^2(t) = 0$, for each $t \in T \setminus T_0$. Conversely, suppose that $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^1(t) = 0$ or $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^2(t) = 0$, for each $t \in T \setminus T_0$. Consider an atom $\tau \in T \setminus T_0$ and assume, without loss of generality, that $\mathbf{w}^1(\tau) = 0$ and $\mathbf{w}^2(\tau) > 0$. Consider the case where $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^1(\tau) = 0$. Then, $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{21}(\tau) = 0$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\tau) = (0, \mathbf{w}^2(\tau))$. We have that $\hat{p}\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\tau) = \hat{p}\mathbf{w}(\tau)$ since

$$\hat{p}^1\hat{\mathbf{x}}^1(\tau) + \hat{p}^2\hat{\mathbf{x}}^2(\tau) = \hat{p}^1 0 + \hat{p}^2(\mathbf{w}^2(\tau) - 0) = \hat{p}^2\mathbf{w}^2(\tau).$$

Let $\hat{x}^2(x^1)$ be a function such that $u_\tau(x^1, \hat{x}^2(x^1)) \equiv u_\tau(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\tau))$, for each $0 \leq x^1 \leq \mathbf{w}^2(\tau) \frac{\hat{p}^2}{\hat{p}^1}$. We have that

$$\frac{\partial u_\tau(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\tau))}{\partial x_1} \frac{\bar{\mathbf{b}}_{21} - \hat{\mathbf{b}}_{21}(\tau)}{\bar{\mathbf{b}}_{21}} \frac{\hat{p}^2}{\hat{p}^1} - \frac{\partial u_\tau(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\tau))}{\partial x_2} \leq 0$$

as $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{21}(\tau) = 0$. Then,

$$\frac{\partial u_\tau(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\tau))}{\partial x_1} \frac{\hat{p}^2}{\hat{p}^1} - \frac{\partial u_\tau(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\tau))}{\partial x_2} \leq 0$$

as $\frac{\bar{\mathbf{b}}_{21} - 0}{\bar{\mathbf{b}}_{21}} = 1$. But then, $\frac{d\hat{x}^2(0)}{dx^1} \geq -\frac{\hat{p}^1}{\hat{p}^2}$. Consider the case where $\frac{d\hat{x}^2(0)}{dx^1} = -\frac{\hat{p}^1}{\hat{p}^2}$. Then, $u_\tau(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\tau)) \geq u_\tau(y)$ for all $y \in \{x \in R_+^2 : \hat{p}x = \hat{p}\mathbf{w}(\tau)\}$, as $u_\tau(\cdot)$ is quasi-concave, by Assumption 2. Consider now the case where $\frac{d\hat{x}^2(0)}{dx^1} > -\frac{\hat{p}^1}{\hat{p}^2}$. Then, $\frac{d\hat{x}^2(x^1)}{dx^1} > -\frac{\hat{p}^1}{\hat{p}^2}$, for each $0 \leq x^1 \leq \mathbf{w}^2(\tau) \frac{\hat{p}^2}{\hat{p}^1}$, as $u_\tau(\cdot)$ is quasi-concave, by Assumption 2. Suppose that there exists a commodity bundle $\tilde{x} \in \{x \in R_+^2 : \hat{p}x = \hat{p}\mathbf{w}(\tau)\}$ such that $u_\tau(\tilde{x}) > u_\tau(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\tau))$. Then, $\tilde{x}^2 > \hat{x}^2(\tilde{x}^1)$ as $u_\tau(\cdot)$ is strongly monotone, by Assumption 2. But then, by the Mean Value Theorem, there exists some \bar{x}^1 such that $0 < \bar{x}^1 < \tilde{x}^1$ and such that

$$\frac{d\hat{x}^2(\bar{x}^1)}{dx^1} = \frac{\hat{x}^2(0) - \hat{x}^2(\bar{x}^1)}{0 - \bar{x}^1} < -\frac{\hat{p}^1}{\hat{p}^2},$$

a contradiction. Therefore, $u_\tau(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\tau)) \geq u_\tau(y)$ for all $y \in \{x \in R_+^2 : \hat{p}x = \hat{p}\mathbf{w}(\tau)\}$.

Consider now the case where $\hat{\mathbf{x}}^2(\tau) = 0$. Then, $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{21}(\tau) = \mathbf{w}^2(\tau)$ and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\tau) = (\mathbf{w}^2(\tau)\frac{\hat{p}^2}{\hat{p}^1}, 0)$. We have that $\hat{p}\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\tau) = \hat{p}\mathbf{w}(\tau)$ since

$$\hat{p}^1\hat{\mathbf{x}}^1(\tau) + \hat{p}^2\hat{\mathbf{x}}^2(\tau) = \hat{p}^1\mathbf{w}^2(\tau)\frac{\hat{p}^2}{\hat{p}^1} + \hat{p}^2(\mathbf{w}^2(\tau) - \mathbf{w}^2(\tau)) = \hat{p}^2\mathbf{w}^2(\tau).$$

Let $\hat{x}^2(x^1)$ be a function such that $u_\tau(x^1, \hat{x}^2(x^1)) \equiv u_\tau(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\tau))$, for each $0 \leq x^1 \leq \mathbf{w}^2(\tau)\frac{\hat{p}^2}{\hat{p}^1}$. We have that

$$\frac{\partial u_\tau(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\tau))}{\partial x_1} \frac{\bar{\mathbf{b}}_{21} - \hat{\mathbf{b}}_{21}(\tau)}{\bar{\mathbf{b}}_{21}} \frac{\hat{p}^2}{\hat{p}^1} - \frac{\partial u_\tau(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\tau))}{\partial x_2} \geq 0$$

as $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{21}(\tau) = \mathbf{w}^2(\tau)$. Then,

$$\frac{\partial u_\tau(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\tau))}{\partial x_1} \frac{\hat{p}^2}{\hat{p}^1} - \frac{\partial u_\tau(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\tau))}{\partial x_2} > 0$$

as $\frac{\bar{\mathbf{b}}_{21} - \mathbf{w}^2(\tau)}{\bar{\mathbf{b}}_{21}} < 1$. But then, $\frac{d\hat{x}^2(x^1)}{dx^1} < -\frac{\hat{p}^1}{\hat{p}^2}$, for each $0 \leq x^1 \leq \mathbf{w}^2(\tau)\frac{\hat{p}^2}{\hat{p}^1}$, as $u_\tau(\cdot)$ is quasi-concave, by Assumption 2. Suppose that there exists a commodity bundle $\tilde{x} \in \{x \in R_+^2 : \hat{p}x = \hat{p}\mathbf{w}(\tau)\}$ such that $u_\tau(\tilde{x}) > u_\tau(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\tau))$. Then, $\tilde{x}^2 > \hat{x}^2(\tilde{x}^1)$ as $u_\tau(\cdot)$ is strongly monotone, by Assumption 2. But then, by the Mean Value Theorem, there exists some \bar{x}^1 such that $\tilde{x}^1 < \bar{x}^1 < \mathbf{w}^2(\tau)\frac{\hat{p}^2}{\hat{p}^1}$ and such that

$$\frac{d\hat{x}^2(\bar{x}^1)}{dx^1} = \frac{\hat{x}^2(\bar{x}^1) - \hat{x}^2(\mathbf{w}^2(\tau)\frac{\hat{p}^2}{\hat{p}^1})}{\bar{x}^1 - \mathbf{w}^2(\tau)\frac{\hat{p}^2}{\hat{p}^1}} > -\frac{\hat{p}^1}{\hat{p}^2},$$

a contradiction. Therefore, $u_\tau(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(\tau)) \geq u_\tau(y)$ for all $y \in \{x \in R_+^2 : \hat{p}x = \hat{p}\mathbf{w}(\tau)\}$. We then conclude that $\hat{p}\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \hat{p}\mathbf{w}(t)$ and $u_t(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)) \geq u_t(y)$ for all $y \in \{x \in R_+^l : \hat{p}x = \hat{p}\mathbf{w}(t)\}$, for each $t \in T \setminus T_0$. Moreover, it is straightforward to show (see, for instance, Proposition 3 in Busetto, Codognato, and Ghosal (2013)) that $\hat{p}\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \hat{p}\mathbf{w}(t)$ and $u_t(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t)) \geq u_t(y)$ for all $y \in \{x \in R_+^2 : \hat{p}x = \hat{p}\mathbf{w}(t)\}$, for each $t \in T_0$. Hence, the pair $(\hat{p}, \hat{\mathbf{x}})$ is a Walras equilibrium. ■

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have reconsidered, in the framework of bilateral oligopoly, the problem raised by Okuno et al. (1980) about the noncooperative foundation of oligopolistic behavior in general equilibrium. We can now summarize the implications of the previous analysis. The condition which requires that the atoms are not “too” big, introduced by Gabszewicz and Mertens (1971), is not necessary for the equivalence between the core and the set of Walras allocations, as shown by Theorem 3, but it is sufficient for this equivalence, by Theorem 2; moreover, it is neither necessary nor sufficient for a nonempty intersection between the sets of Walras and Cournot-Nash allocations as shown, respectively, by Example 7 and Example 4. The condition which requires that there are only atoms of the same type, introduced by Shitovitz (1973), is not necessary for the equivalence between the core and the set of Walras allocations, as shown by Theorem 2, but it is sufficient for this equivalence, by Theorem 3; moreover, it is neither necessary nor sufficient for a nonempty intersection between the sets of Walras and Cournot-Nash allocations as shown, respectively, by Example 6 and Example 5. Theorem 4 states that the condition which characterizes the nonempty intersection of the sets of Walras and Cournot-Nash allocations requires that each atom demands a null amount of one commodity. Moreover, Examples 6 and 7 show that this characterization condition is non-vacuous. We leave as an open problem for further research which assumptions on traders’ size, endowments, and preferences imply this characterization condition. This analysis could help to understand more deeply which are the differences between atoms’ Walrasian behavior in a cooperative and in a noncooperative framework. Some further research should also be devoted to the possibility of generalizing the results achieved in this paper to an exchange economy with more than two commodities.

References

- [1] Amir R., Bloch F. (2009), “Comparative statics in a simple class of strategic market games,” *Games and Economic Behavior* **65**, 7-24.
- [2] Aumann R.J. (1964), “Markets with a continuum of traders,” *Econometrica* **32**, 39-50.

- [3] Bloch F., Ghosal S. (1997), "Stable trading structures in bilateral oligopolies," *Journal of Economic Theory* **74**, 368-384.
- [4] Bloch F., Ferrer H. (2001), "Trade fragmentation and coordination in strategic market games," *Journal of Economic Theory* **101**, 301-316.
- [5] Busetto F., Codognato G., Ghosal S. (2011), "Noncooperative oligopoly in markets with a continuum of traders," *Games and Economic Behavior*, **72**, 38-45.
- [6] Busetto F., Codognato G., Ghosal S. (2013), "Three models of non-cooperative oligopoly in markets with a continuum of traders," *Louvain Economic Review* **79**, 15-32.
- [7] Codognato G., Ghosal S. (2000), "Cournot-Nash equilibria in limit exchange economies with complete markets and consistent prices," *Journal of Mathematical Economics* **34**, 39-53.
- [8] Dickson A., Hartley R. (2008), "The strategic Marshallian cross," *Games and Economic Behavior* **64**, 514-532.
- [9] Gabszewicz J.J., Mertens J.F. (1971), "An equivalence theorem for the core of an economy whose atoms are not "too" big," *Econometrica* **39**, 713-721.
- [10] Gabszewicz J.J., Michel P. (1997), "Oligopoly equilibrium in exchange economies," in Eaton B.C., Harris R. G. (eds), *Trade, technology and economics. Essays in honour of Richard G. Lipsey*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- [11] Giraud G. (2003), "Strategic market games: an introduction," *Journal of Mathematical Economics* **39**, 355-375.
- [12] Okuno M., Postlewaite A., Roberts J. (1980), "Oligopoly and competition in large markets," *American Economic Review* **70**, 22-31.
- [13] Sahi S., Yao S. (1989), "The noncooperative equilibria of a trading economy with complete markets and consistent prices," *Journal of Mathematical Economics* **18**, 325-346.
- [14] Shitovitz B. (1973), "Oligopoly in markets with a continuum of traders," *Econometrica* **41**, 467-501.